13 14

15

9

10

11

12

16 17

19

20

18

21 22

24

25

23

**REMARKS** 

In response to the Office Action dated May 1, 2006, (hereinafter, the "Action"), Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration based on the following remarks.

A review of the claims indicates that:

Claims 1-7 and 9-20 were previously pending.

Claims 21 and 22 have been added.

Claims 1, 3-6, 9, 12, 17, and 20 have been amended.

Claim 8 was previously canceled.

Claim 7 has been canceled.

Claims 1-6 and 9-22 are currently pending in this application, with claims 1, 17, and 20 being independent.

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

The Office rejects claims 9 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office states there is insufficient antecedent basis for the feature in claim 9 reciting "from the message server," and the feature in claim 20 reciting "to the satellite," under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Without conceding the propriety of the stated rejections, and solely to advance the prosecution of this matter, the Applicant submits that the current amendments to claims 9 and 20 overcome the Office's rejection based on insufficient antecedent basis, specifically, claim 9 has been amended to replace "from the message server" to "from a message server," and claim 20 has been amended to replace "to the satellite" to "to a satellite." Applicant submits that claims 9 and 20 are now allowable over the Office's 35 U.S.C. §112, ¶2 rejection.

## Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

The Office rejects claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 10-13, 15, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,272,339 to Wiedeman, hereinafter "Wiedeman" in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0037210 to Hirayama, hereinafter "Hirayama." The Office rejects claim 2 as being unpatentable over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0239399 A1 to Karabinis. The Office rejects claims 3 and 5 as being unpatentable over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0120273A1 to Border, et al, hereinafter "Border." The Office rejects claims 14 and 19 as being unpatentable over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0006910 to Dame, hereinafter "Dame." The Office rejects claims 16 and 18 over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication Publication 2003/0028890 A1 to Swart et al, hereinafter "Swart." These rejections are respectfully traversed.

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

Claim 7 has been canceled and therefore the rejection of this claim is now moot.

#### Claim 1

Turning first to **independent Claim 1**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and without conceding that the Wiedeman and Hirayama references provide the teaching for which they were cited in the Action, the Applicant has amended claim 1 as indicated above. For convenience of discussion, the Applicant reproduces here claim 1 as it would stand after entry of the above revisions:

Claim 1, as amended, defines a method for delivering a stored message to a satellite radio receiver, including:

- receiving a password protected request from a subscriber via
  a wireless communication device associated with a first
  subscription service to retrieve the subscriber's personal
  message, wherein the first subscription service comprises a
  wireless telephone system and wherein the password
  protected request provides access to the wireless telephone
  system;
- retrieving the message from a second subscription service,
   wherein the second subscription service comprises a digital
   data network that transfers data using Internet Protocol (IP)

5

7

8

9

10

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

19 20

21 22

24

23

25

and wherein the password protected request is converted to digital data and the password protected request gains access to the digital data network in addition to gaining access to the wireless telephone system;

- · encoding the message for satellite transmission; and
- transmitting the message to a satellite via the second subscription service for delivery to the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver decodes the message, and
- wherein the password protected request includes a specific location for finding the message on one of multiple servers of the digital data network and wherein the password protected request includes a specific destination location of the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver is installed in an automobile.

The Applicant submits that the above revisions to claim 1 are fully supported under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, at least by page 5, paragraph [0015] of the Applicant's Specification, as well as by Figure 2.

The Wiedeman patent pertains generally to a global mobile paging system that enables users of the system to receive pages based on location and availability, with an added ability to roam freely and receive pages over wide geographical areas (Wiedeman, Col 1, lines 45-50 and 57-62). The system allows the receipt of pages over regions where there are incompatible paging systems,

thereby giving the user the ability to roam without fear of missing a page (Col 2, lines 6-10).

The Wiedeman reference does not teach or suggest every element of Applicant's amended claim 1. For example, Wiedeman does not teach or suggest a "...password protected request from a subscriber via a wireless communication device associated with a first subscription service to retrieve the subscriber's personal message, wherein the first subscription service comprises a wireless telephone system, and wherein the password protected request provides access to the wireless telephone system; retrieving the message from a second subscription service...wherein the password protected request gains access to [a] digital data network in addition to gaining access to the wireless telephone system; ...transmitting the message to a satellite...for delivery to the satellite radio receiver...wherein the password protected request includes a specific location for finding the message on one of multiple servers of the digital data network and wherein the password protected request includes a specific destination location of the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver is installed in an automobile," as in Applicant's claim 1 after entry of the above revisions.

Instead, the Wiedeman reference, in contrast to claim 1, discloses a communications system that enables users to receive paging messages through a satellite-based communications system or a conventional terrestrial paging system, based in part on the location or availability of the user (Wiedeman, Col. 1, lines 46-51). This system in Wiedeman does not teach or suggest a method for delivery of a stored message to a satellite radio receiver, where the initial password protected request for a personal message includes the location of the message on a

LEE & HAYES, PLLC

 specific server in addition to the location of the satellite radio receiver for delivery of the message, particularly, a specific satellite radio receiver installed in an automobile.

The method disclosed in amended claim 1 enables a subscriber with paid subscriptions to multiple wireless communication services to request and receive a stored personal message across services for eventual listening via a satellite radio receiver in an automobile. The satellite radio receiver in the automobile is used for a satellite radio subscription service that may include numerous programs, such as music and talk radio shows. The method of claim 1 requires secure password entry upon a subscriber request for messages, where the password protected request provides both security and information regarding server location of the requested message and satellite radio receiver location for message delivery. Because the Wiedeman patent does not teach or suggest every element of the method of Applicant's claim 1, Applicant submits claim 1 is allowable over Wiedeman.

Likewise, the Hirayama publication does not teach or suggest every element of amended claim 1. That is, Hirayama does not teach or suggest "...wherein the password protected request includes a specific location for finding the message on one of multiple servers of [a] digital data network and wherein the password protected request includes a specific destination location of the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver is installed in an automobile..." as in Applicant's claim 1 after entry of the above revisions. In contrast, Hirayama pertains to a customer management system for retail stores, which streamlines the reception and organization of customer information while reducing time and

money spent by the stores (Hirayama, ¶0006 and ¶0007). The system in Hirayama does not teach or suggest every element of Applicant's claim 1, and therefore adds nothing to the missing teachings of the Wiedeman reference.

Because the Wiedeman and Hirayama references do not teach or suggest each element of Applicant's claim 1, Applicant submits claim 1 is not obvious over Wiedeman and Hirayama. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as amended, overcomes rejection under these references.

#### Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 10-13 and 15

Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 10-13 and 15 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1. For at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 10-13 and 15 are also allowable over the Wiedeman and Hirayama references. Claims 4, 6, 7, 9, 10-13 and 15 depend from claim 1, and therefore, these claims should also be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 when contrasted with the Wiedeman and Hirayama references as well as for the additional features they recite.

#### Claim 17

Turning next to **independent Claim 17**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and without conceding that the Wiedeman and Hirayama references provide the teaching for which they were cited in the Action, the Applicant has amended claim 17 as indicated above. For convenience of discussion, the Applicant reproduces here claim 17 as it would stand after entry of the above revisions:

\_

ι7

Claim 17 defines a computer program stored on a computer readable medium, including instructions to:

- receive a password protected request from a subscriber via a
   wireless communication device associated with a first
   subscription service to retrieve the subscriber's personal
   message, wherein the first subscription service comprises a
   wireless telephone system and wherein the password
   protected request gains access to the wireless telephone
   system;
- retrieve the message stored for a subscriber from a message server via a second subscription service, wherein the second subscription service comprises a digital data network that transfers data using Internet Protocol (IP) and wherein the password protected request is converted to digital data and the password protected request gains access to the digital data network in addition to gaining access to the wireless telephone system; and
- encode the message via the server for satellite transmission.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17, as amended, is also not obvious over the Wiedeman and Hirayama references for similar reasons as explained for amended claim 1. Claim 17 describes a computer program stored on a computer readable medium with instructions for subscriber retrieval of personal messages,

where a password protected request for messages from a wireless telephone system subscription service gains access to both the wireless telephone system subscription service and the digital data network of a second subscription service. The Wiedeman and Hirayama references do not teach or suggest a computer program with instructions for achieving access to more than one subscription service via a password protected request for personal messages, as in Applicant's claim 17. Instead, Wiedeman pertains to a communications system that enables users to receive paging messages through a satellite-based communications system or a conventional terrestrial paging system based on the location or availability of the user (Wiedeman, Col. 1, lines 46-51), and Hirayama pertains to a customer management system for retail stores which streamlines the reception and organization of customer information while reducing time and money spent by the stores (Hirayama, ¶0006 and ¶0007). Because the Wiedeman and Hirayama references do not teach or suggest each element of Applicant's claim 17, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 17 is not obvious over Wiedeman and Hirayama, and is therefore allowable.

#### Claim 20

Turning next to **independent Claim 20**, without conceding the propriety of the stated rejection, and without conceding that the Wiedeman and Hirayama references provide the teaching for which they were cited in the Action, the Applicant has amended claim 20 as indicated above. For convenience of discussion, the Applicant reproduces here portions of claim 20 as it would stand after entry of the above revisions:

3

4

7

9

10

11

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

Claim 20, as amended, defines a system for delivering a stored message to a satellite radio receiver, including:

- means for receiving a password protected request from a subscriber via a wireless communication device associated with a first subscription service to retrieve the subscriber's personal message, wherein the first subscription service comprises a wireless telephone system and wherein the password protected request gains access to the wireless telephone system;
- means for retrieving the message from a message server of a second subscription service, wherein the second subscription service comprises a digital data network that transfers data using Internet Protocol (IP) and wherein the password protected request is converted to digital data and the password protected request gains access to the digital data network in addition to gaining access to the wireless telephone system;
- means for encoding the message via a server for satellite transmission;
- means for transmitting the message to a satellite via the second subscription service for delivery to the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver decodes the message, and

3

6

5

7

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

• wherein the password protected request includes a specific location for finding the message on one of multiple servers of the digital data network and wherein the password protected request includes a specific destination location of the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver is installed in an automobile.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20, as amended, also overcomes rejection under 35 USC §103(a) and is not obvious over the Wiedeman and Hirayama references for similar reasons as explained for claim 1. Claim 20 describes a system where a password protected request for a personal message achieves access to a wireless telephone system subscription service and to a digital data network of a second subscription service. Applicant's claim 20 also describes a "...password protected request [that] includes a specific location for finding the message on one of multiple servers of the digital data network and wherein the password protected request includes a specific destination location of the satellite radio receiver, wherein the satellite radio receiver is installed in an automobile." The Wiedeman and Hirayama references do not teach or suggest a system for delivering a stored message to a satellite radio receiver with a password protected request for a personal message that accesses more than one subscription service and also reveals the location of the personal message as well as the satellite radio receiver location for message delivery, as in Applicant's amended claim 20. Because Wiedeman and Hirayama do not teach or suggest each element of

. 

Applicant's claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 20 is not obvious over the Wiedeman and Hirayama references, and therefore, is allowable.

#### Claim 2

The Office rejects claim 2 as being unpatentable over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2005/0239399 A1 to Karabinis. The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 2 depends directly from independent claim 1. Therefore, the comments directed above to claim 1 apply equally to claim 2, as well as for the additional features recited in this dependent claims.

For at least these reasons set forth with respect to amended claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent claim 2 is also not obvious over Wiedeman and Hirayama. Further, the Karabinis publication adds nothing to the missing teachings of Wiedeman and Hirayama considering current amendments to claim 1. Claim 2 depends from claim 1, and therefore, this claim should be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

## Claims 3 and 5

The Office rejects claims 3 and 5 as being unpatentable over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Publication 2004/0120273A1 to Border, et al, hereinafter "Border." The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 3 and 5 directly from independent claim 1. Therefore, the comments directed above to amended claim 1 apply equally to claims 3 and 5, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims.

For at least these reasons set forth with respect to amended claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent claims 3 and 5 are also not obvious over Wiedeman and Hirayama. Further, the Border publication adds nothing to the missing teachings of Wiedeman and Hirayama considering current amendments to claim 1. Claims 3 and 5 depend from claim 1, and therefore, these claims should be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

#### Claims 14 and 19

The Office rejects claims 14 and 19 as being unpatentable over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0006910 to Dame, hereinafter "Dame." The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 14 and 19 depend directly from independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. Therefore, the comments directed above to amended claims 1 and 17 apply equally to claims 14 and 19, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims.

For at least these reasons set forth with respect to amended claims 1 and 17, Applicant submits that dependent claims 4 and 19 are also not obvious over Wiedeman and Hirayama. Further, the Dame publication adds nothing to the missing teachings of Wiedeman and Hirayama considering current amendments to claims 1 and 17. Claims 4 and 19 depend from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and

therefore, these claims should be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 17.

#### Claims 16 and 18

The Office rejects claims 16 and 18 over Wiedeman in view of Hirayama, further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication 2003/0028890 A1 to Swart et al, hereinafter "Swart." The Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 16 and 18 depend directly from independent claims 1 and 17, respectively. Therefore, the comments directed above to amended claims 1 and 17 apply equally to claims 16 and 18, as well as for the additional features recited in these dependent claims.

For at least these reasons set forth with respect to amended claims 1 and 17, Applicant submits that dependent claims 16 and 18 are also not obvious over Wiedeman and Hirayama. Further, the Swart publication adds nothing to the missing teachings of Wiedeman and Hirayama considering current amendments to claims 1 and 17. Claims 16 and 18 depend from claims 1 and 17, respectively, and therefore, these claims should be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claims 1 and 17.

Con

3 4

2

7

8

6

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

# Conclusion

The Applicant submits that all of the claims in this application are now in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a Notice of Allowability be issued. If there are any questions, Applicant respectfully requests that the undersigned attorney be contacted for the purpose of scheduling an interview.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated:  $\frac{7/10/06}{}$ 

By:

Emily H. Ling

Reg. No. # 58,619

Lee & Hayes PLLC

Suite 500

421 W. Riverside Avenue Spokane, Washington 99201

Telephone: 509-324-9256 x222

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979